

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

ANDREW R. PERRONG
1657 THE FAIRWAY #131, JENKINTOWN, PA 19046

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff MONTGOMERY
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

ANDREW R. PERRONG (PRO SE); 1657 THE FAIRWAY
#131, JENKINTOWN, PA 19046; 215-791-6957

DEFENDANTS

CALLER IDENTIFIED AS CONNOR
UNKNOWN

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant UNKNOWN

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

JUL 07 2022

AT 8:30

M

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 U.S. Government Defendant	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/> PERSONAL INJURY	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine	<input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane	<input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	<input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
<input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment
<input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument	<input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	<input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust	<input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking
<input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud	<input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce	<input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation
<input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine	<input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending	<input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	<input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692)
<input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	<input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage	<input type="checkbox"/> 480 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV	<input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
<input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits	<input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts
<input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract	<input type="checkbox"/> Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations	<input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters	<input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	<input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	<input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration
<input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	SOCIAL SECURITY	<input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
<input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation	<input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	<input type="checkbox"/> Habeas Corpus:	<input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff)	
<input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure	<input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting	<input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee	<input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923)	
<input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	<input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	<input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	
<input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land	<input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/ Accommodations	<input type="checkbox"/> 530 General	<input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI	
<input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/ Disabilities - Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty	<input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	
<input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/ Disabilities - Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> IMMIGRATION	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application	
		<input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights	<input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	
		<input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition		
		<input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 Original Proceeding	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Removed from State Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Reinstated or Reopened	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File
---	---	--	---	--	--	---

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 47 USC 227; 47 CFR 64.1200

Brief description of cause:
DEFENDANT CALLED PLAINTIFF IN VIOLATION OF THE TCPA

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$

25,200

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See Instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

07/05/2022

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.

VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.

VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
CAMDEN VICINAGE

R E C E I V E D

ANDREW R. PERRONG
1657 THE FAIRWAY #131
JENKINTOWN, PA 19046

Plaintiff

vs.

CALLER IDENTIFIED AS CONNOR

Defendant.

JUL 07 2022

AT 8:30 M
WILLIAM T. WALSH
CLERK

Case No.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT

Preliminary Statement

1. Plaintiff Andrew R. Perrong (“Plaintiff”), brings this action under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227, a federal statute enacted in response to widespread public outrage about the proliferation of intrusive, nuisance calling practices. *See Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 745 (2012).

2. The as-yet unidentified Defendant in this action (“Defendant”), who goes by the generic name “Connor,” and who transmits the caller ID 856-209-6591, sent automated calls to Plaintiff, which is prohibited by the TCPA.

3. The Plaintiff never consented to receive such calls, which were placed to him for telemarketing purposes.

Parties

4. Plaintiff Andrew R. Perrong is a Pennsylvania resident, and a resident of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

5. Defendant is unidentified at this time, and is only identified by its caller ID, 856-209-6591 and the generic name provided on the calls of “Connor.” The Defendant engages in calling activity from this District and Vicinage, as it did with the Plaintiff and as evidenced by its calling area code, telephone number, and transmitted caller ID “CAMDEN NJ”. After this complaint is filed, Plaintiff will make a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1) to serve a subpoena on the carrier(s) for 856-209-6591 to ascertain the identity of the Defendant.

Jurisdiction & Venue

6. The Court has federal question subject matter jurisdiction over these TCPA claims. *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Services, LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).

7. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District, as the automated calls to the Plaintiff was placed from this District and Vicinage.

The Telephone Consumer Protection Act

8. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA to regulate the explosive growth of the automated calling industry. In so doing, Congress recognized that “[u]nrestricted telemarketing . . . can be an intrusive invasion of privacy [.]” Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-243, § 2(5) (1991) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227).

The TCPA Prohibits all Automated Calls To Protected Numbers

9. The TCPA makes it unlawful “to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice . . . to any telephone number assigned to a . . . paging service, cellular telephone service, specialized mobile radio

service, or other radio common carrier service, or any service for which the called party is charged for the call.” *See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).*

10. Congress singled out these services for special protection either because Congress realized their special importance in terms of consumer privacy and therefore protected them (as in the case of cellular phones), or because the numbers are assigned to services, like Mr. Perrong’s VoIP service, for which the called party is charged, thus shifting the cost of automated or prerecorded telephone calls onto consumers. *See Barr v. Am. Ass’n of Pol. Consultants, Inc.*, 140 S. Ct. 2335, 2363, (2020) (Gorsuch, J. & Thomas, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part).

11. According to findings by the Federal Communication Commission (“FCC”), the agency Congress vested with authority to issue regulations implementing the TCPA, such calls are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live calls, and such calls can be costly and inconvenient.

12. The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). *See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).*

13. This cause of action applies to users of any one of the four protected services (pager, cellular, specialized mobile radio [i.e. radiotelephony locator beacons or dispatch systems], or another radio common carrier service [i.e. ship-to-shore or air-to-ground]), or any service, including residential, VoIP, and landline services, for which the called party is charged for the call. *See Lynn v. Monarch Recovery Mgmt., Inc.*, 953 F. Supp. 2d 612, 623 (D. Md. 2013).

14. “Non-emergency prerecorded voice or autodialed calls to [the destinations enumerated in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)] are permissible only with the prior express consent of the called party.” This includes telemarketing calls. *See FCC Enforcement Advisory: Tel. Consumer Prot. Act Robocall & Text Rules - Biennial Reminder for Pol. Campaigns About Robocall & Text Abuse*, 31 FCC Rcd. 1940, 1941 n.6 (2016) [hereinafter FCC Advisory].

Factual Allegations

15. Defendant is a telemarketer and/or entity that places automated calls for the purpose of renting and selling property.

16. To generate sales, Defendant relies on automated calling.

The Calls to Mr. Perrong

17. Plaintiff Perrong is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

18. Plaintiff’s telephone number (the “Number”), 215-947-XXXX, is on the National Do Not Call Registry and has been continuously since 2005.

19. The Number has also been on the Pennsylvania Do Not Call Registry for at least 31 days prior to the calls at issue here.

20. Despite this, the Defendant placed four telemarketing calls to Plaintiff on June 10, 13, 14, and 21, 2022.

21. Upon information and belief, Defendant is not registered as a telemarketer with the Attorney General of Pennsylvania.

22. The Number is assigned to a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) telephone service, which allows for voice calls to be placed over a broadband Internet connection.

23. The Number, which is assigned to a VoIP telephone service, is charged for each call it receives.

24. The VoIP telephone service for the Number is Anveo.
25. The service charges a ring charge of \$0.005 for the provision of Caller ID Name lookup information for each call placed to the Number, even if the call is not answered.
26. The service also charges a per-minute charge of \$0.004 per minute for voice charges for each minute of talk time, including voicemail time, for each call placed to the Number.
27. The Number is therefore “assigned to a . . . service for which the called party is charged for the call” and any call placed to that number are subject to the restrictions enumerated in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
28. On June 10, 2022 at 6:34 PM, the Plaintiff received a call from the Defendant with the caller ID 856-209-6591, which transmitted the generic Caller ID name “CAMDEN NJ”.
29. The Plaintiff did not answer this call, but the caller, “Connor,” indicated he was calling in reference to a property at 23 W. 3rd St. in Pottstown, PA.
30. Despite that, and the fact that he was on the National Do Not Call Registry, the Defendant made three more telemarketing calls to the Plaintiff, on June 13, 2022 at 4:27 PM, June 14, 2022 at 4:44 PM, and June 21, 2022 at 3:23 PM.
31. During each of these calls, “Connor” left nearly identical messages indicating he was calling regarding a property at 23 W. 3rd St. in Pottstown, PA.
32. The caller was not identified during any of the calls apart from the name of “Connor”.
33. In addition, the calls were conducted using an Automatic Telephone Dialing System (ATDS).
34. The service provider for the telephone number 856-209-6591 is RingCentral.

35. As the Supreme Court recently clarified, the key feature of an ATDS is the capacity to store numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator or to produce numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator. *Facebook, Inc. v. Duguid*, 141 S. Ct. 1163, 1167 (2021).

36. RingCentral's website boasts the ability to automatically dial numbers and automate tasks, calls, and SMS using both built in and 3rd party apps, including from lists. See *Workflow Automation: What It Is + How to Get More Done with It*, RINGCENTRAL, <https://www.ringcentral.com/us/en/blog/workflow-automation/> [<https://archive.ph/lEf4U>].

37. Courts have held post-*Facebook* that allegations similar to those as here of the absence of a relationship between the parties, the generic nature of a call, and telephone company practices are all indicia of the random or sequential nature of the dialing device that gives rise to the inference at the pleadings stage that an ATDS was used. See *Camunas v. Nat'l Republican Senatorial Comm.*, No. 21-1005, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 100125 at *11 (E.D. Pa. May 26, 2021).

38. Plaintiff is ignorant of the exact process by which the system(s) used by the Defendant operates other than drawing the reasonable inference and making the allegation that it stores or produces telephone numbers randomly or possibly sequentially based on the facts ascertainable from the calls he received, as outlined above. Indeed, as at least one district court explained, "The newly clarified definition of an ATDS is more relevant to a summary judgment motion than at the pleading stage." *Gross v. GG Homes, Inc.*, No. 3:21-cv-00271-DMS-BGS, 2021 WL 2863623, at *7 (S.D. Cal. July 8, 2021); *accord Miles v. Medicredit, Inc.*, No. 4:20-cv-01186-JAR, 2021 WL 2949565 (E.D. Mo. July 14, 2021).

39. The Plaintiff never provided his consent or requested these calls.

40. Based on this fact, and the fact that Defendant went out of its way to conceal its identity for illegal calling conduct, it is evident that Defendant does not maintain Do Not Call policies and procedures as required by law, nor does it maintain an internal Do Not Call list.

41. The Plaintiff was charged \$0.036 for the calls.

42. Plaintiff was harmed by these calls. He was temporarily deprived of legitimate use of his phone because his phone line was tied up during the automated calls and his privacy was improperly invaded. The Plaintiff was charged for the calls. Moreover, these calls injured Plaintiff because they were frustrating, obnoxious, annoying, were a nuisance and disturbed the solitude of Plaintiff.

Legal Claims

Count One: Violation of the TCPA's Prohibition Against Automated Calling With an Automatic Telephone Dialing System (ATDS)

43. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations from all previous paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

44. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf constitute numerous and multiple violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to the telephone number(s) of Plaintiff using an ATDS.

45. As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf's violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500 in damages for each and every call made to his telephone number for which he is charged for the call using an ATDS in violation of the statute, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

46. Plaintiff is also entitled to and does seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf from violating the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to any number using an artificial or prerecorded voice in the future.

47. The Defendant's violations were wilful and/or knowing.

Count Two:
Violation of the Pennsylvania Telemarketer Registration Act
73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 2241

48. By placing at least four telemarketing calls to the Plaintiff without registering as telemarketers under Pennsylvania law, Defendant violated 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 2243.

49. This constitutes four violations of the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law. 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 2246(a).

50. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Pennsylvania Telemarketer Registration Act (PTRA), 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 2241, including by making calls to Plaintiff's number, on the Pennsylvania Do-Not-Call registry, without registration.

51. As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on their behalf's violations of the PTRA, 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 2241, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$300 in damages for each and every call made to his telephone number in violation of the statute, pursuant to the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law, 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 201. *See* 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 2246(a).

52. Plaintiff is also entitled to and does seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on their behalf from violating the PTRA in the future.

Count Three:
Violation of the TCPA's Implementing Regulations
Codified at 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200

53. By placing at least four telemarketing calls to the Plaintiff, whose number is on the Do-Not-Call registry, failing to have a written Do-Not-Call policy, and failing to maintain the Plaintiff on its Do-Not-Call list, Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) by violating the implementing regulations codified in 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c) and (d).

54. This amounts to twelve violations since Defendant committed three violations per call. The first violation is calling a number on the national Do-Not-Call registry. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2). The second violation is by calling Plaintiff without having a Do-Not-Call policy in place. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(1). The third violation is by calling Plaintiff without maintaining the Plaintiff on its internal Do-Not-Call list. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(6).

55. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf constitute at least twelve violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), codified at 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200, by, *inter alia*, refusing to scrub against the National Do-Not-Call registry, refusing to maintain Mr. Perrong's number on an internal Do-Not-Call list, and failing to have a Do-Not-Call policy.

56. As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on its behalf's violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500 in damages for each and every call and violation made to his telephone number

in violation of the TCPA's implementing regulations codified at 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B).

57. Plaintiff is also entitled to and does seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on its behalf from violating the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), by making calls in violation of any of the TCPA's implementing regulations in the future.

58. The Defendant's violations were knowing and/or willful. Accordingly, the Plaintiff seeks up to treble damages of the \$500 per violation award, as provided in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

Relief Sought

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests the following relief:

- A. Injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant from calling telephone numbers using an artificial or prerecorded voice and/or ATDS.
- B. Because of Defendant's violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in damages for each violation or—where such regulations were willfully or knowingly violated—up to \$1,500 per violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3) or 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).
- C. Because of Defendant's violations of the PTRA, Plaintiff Perrong seeks for himself \$300 in damages for each violation, pursuant to 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 201-9.2(a).
- D. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Plaintiff requests a jury trial as to all claims of the complaint so triable.

Dated: **July 5, 2022**



Andrew R. Perrong
Plaintiff Pro-Se
1657 The Fairway #131
Jenkintown, PA 19046
Phone: 215-791-6957
Facsimile: 888-329-0305
andyperrong@gmail.com